

# San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 10600, San Francisco, California 94102 tel 415 352 3600 fax 415 352 3606

November 10, 2015

**TO:** Bay Fill Policies Working Group Members

**FROM:** Lawrence J. Goldzband, Executive Director (415/352-3653; [larry.goldzband@bcdc.ca.gov](mailto:larry.goldzband@bcdc.ca.gov))  
Joe LaClair, Chief Planning Officer (415/352-3656; [joe.laclair@bcdc.ca.gov](mailto:joe.laclair@bcdc.ca.gov))  
Brenda Goeden, Sediment Program Manager (415/352-3623; [brenda.goeden@bcdc.ca.gov](mailto:brenda.goeden@bcdc.ca.gov))

**SUBJECT: October 15, 2015 Commission Fill Policies Working Group Meeting Summary**

**ATTENDEES:** Commissioners: Barry Nelson, Chair, Katerina Galacatos, Jim McGrath and Sean Randolph. Public attendees: John Coleman and Michael Conner

1. **Roll Call, Introductions and Approval of Agenda.** Chair, Barry Nelson, called the meeting to order at approximately 11:00 am.

2. **Approval of the October 15, 2015 Meeting Summary.** The summary was approved.

3. **Work Plan Update.** The Working Group (WG) discussed the updated work plan. Discussion highlights included:

- a. Deleted specific Policies for A Rising Bay Project (PRB) updates, because staff is uncertain when they will occur, but will regularly brief the WG on PRB as necessary. Upcoming WG briefings on PRB include May 2016 when the WG will review and discuss the outcomes and findings of PRB. Also:
  - i. Use the January 21<sup>st</sup> WG meeting to preview the case study analysis results to be presented at the PRB Steering Committee.
  - ii. During the spring, review draft preliminary conclusions regarding how policies are and can be interpreted.
- b. PRB will be wrapping up before the WG concludes. The NOAA grant requires deliverables by June 2016, which does not require Commission action. WG concludes in 2017.
- c. WG members stated that reviewing the conclusions of PRB may require two meetings.
- d. The WG may want to provide an interim report/set of questions to full Commission regarding outcomes of PRB.
  - i. An initial report would help inform the Commission of the WG discussions and helps the staff address Commission's questions, concerns and comments.

- ii. It is anticipated that the presentation to Commission regarding PRB will generate enough discussion from the Commission to bounce back to the WG to further explore policy questions and options.
- e. The WG questioned but did not decide whether they should cancel the 12/17 meeting.
- f. Can we go forward with further discussion on in-Bay placement without National Marine Fisheries Service and US Fish and Wildlife involved in the discussion?
- g. The LTMS Program just funded a three-year study (Strategic Placement of Dredged Material), consultants MWH – SFEI will lead the study to identify a conceptual model, engage stakeholders to identify hurdles and challenges, develop a pilot project design- the contract was for \$700k over three years and will be completed by 2018. BCDC, as an LTMS partner will have a direct role in guiding the study.
- h. How do we engage NMFS on issue of Bay Fill for adaptation to sea level rise so they are comfortable with potential WG recommendations?
  - i. Include NMFS in the December 21st or January 21<sup>st</sup> WG Meeting?
  - ii. Chair Nelson and WG members agreed that staff should meet with NMFS staff, to determine how to best engage them in work group discussions around potential adaptation measures.
    - (a) Gary Stern and Korie Schaeffer of NMFS would be the contact for this meeting. Brenda and Steve will take the lead on this contact.

**4. East Bay Dischargers Authority Sea Level Rise Adaptation Planning Project.** Michael Connor of East Bay Dischargers Authority (EBDA) presented EBDA's Sea Level Rise Planning Project. The full presentation can be found at the Bay Fill Policies Working Group webpage. Presentation and WG discussion highlights included:

- a. There are always tradeoffs. Ultimately, agencies made joint decisions every month between water reuse for human consumption and water reuse for habitat/ecological impacts.
- b. Discussions of contingency planning/adaptive management planning to monitor what works and what doesn't work.
- c. The EBDA's Project received funding from SCC under the climate ready grant to look at long-term issues for EBDA and how they deal with effluent.
- d. Wastewater effluent is treated by local jurisdictions and pumped to the EBDA outfall for single point discharge into the Bay.
- e. Wastewater managers and society's thinking of pollution has changed over the years. Industrial activities are very low around the Bay.
- f. The waste water treatment facilities produce nutrient-rich solids – can we use them in the Baylands?

- i. As salinity rises, what kind of vegetative growth or sediment accumulation can you expect along the shoreline to keep up with sea level rise? How much growth do you get with higher levels of nutrients?
  - g. As wastewater treatment evolves, small treatment plants around/within communities have generally become more accepted, communities are more willing to use recycled/treated wastewater within that community.
  - h. Oro Loma Plant – Horizontal Levee case study, considerations included:
    - i. More storage was needed for nutrient removal.
    - ii. Water seepage slope that comes through the horizontal level, testing how much water can get through.
    - iii. How much nitrate can you remove?
    - iv. It took three years to permit, one year to build, 25-30% of budget to permit.
    - v. The project was designed as an alternative to a large, concrete holding basin.
  - i. Permitting through resource and regulatory agencies can prove to be difficult, due to competing demands, laws and policies. Examples include:
    - i. Recycled water need will increase
    - ii. Strict nutrient discharge limits
  - j. Additional questions for consideration: given the sediment deficit in the Bay and that biosolids are safe enough for agriculture, why is it not sufficient for the Bay?
    - i. Sediment deficit could be reduced solely with use of treated sewage sludge generated by waste water dischargers.
    - ii. How do biosolids compare to other types of sediments used?
      - (a) Organic matter, adding and substituting?
      - (b) In general, biosolid materials are cleaner and safer than they were historically.
5. **Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:30 p.m.